

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/325,705	06/04/1999	TORU YAMADA	088941-0138	3162
7590 02/04/2004			EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER			WONG, ALLEN C	
WASHINGTON HARBOUR 3000 K STREET N W SUITE 500 P O BOX 25696			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 200078696		DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/325,705	YAMADA, TORU				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Allen Wong	2613				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin- FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) _ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	,,					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10. Other:		22lla				
		HRIS KELLEY ORY PATENT EXAMINER				
. Patent and Trademark Office	SUPERVISC	COCY CENTER 2600				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: all of the broad limitations of the claims are met by the combination of Yonemitsu in view of Matsushima. The applicant has essentially argued the same point as before in the applicant's previous response sent on July 22, 2003. As stated before, applicant asserts that Yonemitsu does not disclose the field selector to select one of odd and even fields forming each frame. The examiner respectfully disagrees. See figure 29 and and col.29, ln.3-8. At the field encoding mode, note that only one field, ie. even or odd, is selected for use during the determination of the frame based on the pixel data calculations, where each field has some of the plurality of field blocks in which a group of field pixels form a field block. Thus, the field, odd or even, that best represents the frame image is determined by calculating the even field motion vector and the odd field motion vector. And whichever field motion vector has the least amount of error, that field motion vector will ultimately determine the field used for display a high quality image frame.